



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,467	12/02/2003	Chiang Li	22596-538	5864

30623 7590 09/26/2006

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY
AND POPEO, P.C.
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

RAE, CHARLESWORTH E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1614

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/726,467

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Charleswort Rae

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Restriction/Election of Species

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-31, and 36-39, drawn to a method of administering a composition of a cell cycle checkpoint activator and an oncogenic kinase modulator, classified in class 514, subclass 252.18.
- II. Claims 32-35, drawn to a kit product comprising a β -lapachone, or a β -lapachone derivative, or a β -lapachone analog, and an oncogenic kinase modulator, classified in class 514, subclass 455.

Inventions 1 and II are related as process of use and product. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product. For example, the process of using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product; namely, β -lapachone in combination with paclitaxel, as disclosed in the specification wherein it is stated that "... β -lapachone, when combined with Taxol® (paclitaxel; Bristol –Myers Squibb Co. N.Y., N.Y.) ...has effective anti-tumor activity...." (see Specification: page 2, lines 1-4).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the

Art Unit: 1614

search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes is proper. While Groups I and II can be identically classified under U.S. Patent Classification guidelines, to search them together would present an undue search burden on the Examiner due to the extensive databases of patent and non-patent literature that would have to be searched in view of the multiplicity of treatable cancers, and the multiplicity of combinations of species of cell cycle checkpoint activators and oncogenic kinase modulators that are encompassed by both Group I and Group II. Thus, Groups I and II have been appropriately restricted on the basis of being both independent or distinct and presenting a search burden on the Examiner if they were to be searched together.

Rejoinder Notice

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product

Art Unit: 1614

are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of cancer: multiple myeloma, chronic myelogenous leukemia, pancreatic cancer, non-small cell lung cancer, breast cancer, ovarian cancer, prostate cancer, malignant melanoma, non-melanoma skin cancers, hematologic tumors, hematologic malignancies, childhood leukemia, childhood lymphomas, Hodgkin's disease, lymphomas of lymphocytic origin, lymphomas of cutaneous origin, acute leukemia, chronic leukemia, acute lymphoblastic leukemia, acute myelocytic leukemia, chronic myelocytic leukemia, plasma cell neoplasm, lymphoid neoplasm and cancers associated with AIDS. The species are independent or distinct because they represent morphologically distinct tumor types that have acquired a separate status in the art.

In addition, claims 1-39 encompass oncogenic kinase modulators that may be subdivided into two subordinate groups (or sub genera) based on pharmacologic function 1) epidermal growth factor receptor signal transduction pathway modulator and 2) Bcr-Abl signal transduction pathway modulator. Also, claims 1-39 encompass a multiplicity of combinations of cycle checkpoint activators and oncogenic kinase modulators. Thus, an undue search burden will be created based on the independent or distinct tumor types, sub-genera of oncogenic kinase modulators, and multiplicity of combinations of cell cycle checkpoint activators and oncogenic kinase modulators encompassed by the claims. In view of the undue search burden, applicant is required to elect a single cancer species and a single specific combination of a cell cycle checkpoint activator and an oncogenic kinase modulator for examination purposes and provide justification for the election with respect to differences in tumor type, or differences in function or structure of the elected species of cell cycle check point activator and oncogenic kinase modulator.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1 and 32 are generic to the above species.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim

is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.
MPEP § 809.02(a).

Election/Restrictions Proper

MPEP 809.02(d) states “[w]here only generic claims are presented, no restriction can be required except in those applications where the generic claims recite such a multiplicity of species that an unduly extensive and burdensome search is necessary.” Here, the claims recited such multiplicity of species that an unduly extensive and burdensome search would be necessary if all of the claimed species were to be examined simultaneously.

The present claims 1-31 and 36-39 are directed to a method of treating cancer comprising administering a cell cycle checkpoint activator and an oncogenic kinase modulator, while claims 32-35 are directed to a kit for treating malignancy comprising a β -lapachone or a derivative, or analog and an oncogenic kinase modulator. Notwithstanding that the classification of some of the active agents is co-extensive, all of the claimed species are patently distinct and fully capable of supporting separate patents.

Inventorship Notice

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Inventions I and II are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious undue burden on the examiner if restriction is not required as the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification. Also, the claims consonant with the inventions recite a multiplicity of species as stated above, which further increases the search burden on the examiner. Thus, the restriction and election of species requirements for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charlesworth Rae whose telephone number is 571-272-6029. The examiner can normally be reached between 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, can be reached at 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 800-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 1614

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

19 September 2006
CER

 9/20/06
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER